Progressive Calvinism

Copyright, 1955, by Progressive Calvinism League

VOLUME I JUNE, 1955 NUMBER 6

Contents

	Page
A Word to Readers	145
Cain: a Murderer, a Liar, and a Lawgiver	147
New Doubts Among Calvinists Whether Psalm One Belongs in the Canon of Scripture	149
Feudalism, Individualism, Socialism, Syndicalism and Interventionism	152

A Word to Readers

Five issues of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM have been published. In the first issue (January, 1955) we outlined our principles and stated our purposes.

In the second issue we began a series of articles on brotherly love. We felt constrained to do so because PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM is a publication in two fields — in economics and in ethics. We considered it prudent to explain first certain fundamental ideas in our ethics. Readers already know that we object to sanctimonious ethics — a being holier than the Christian religion teaches. With Solomon we fervently say: "Be not too righteous." It took four issues to summarize (and the work is not complete) our ideas on brotherly love.

In this issue we make another small contribution to the idea of brotherly love, under the title, *Cain: a Murderer, a Liar, and a Lawgiver.* Then we turn to new subjects, such as the relationship

Published each month by the Progressive Calvinism League. Founders of the League: Frederick Nymeyer, John Van Mouwerik and Martin B. Nymeyer. Subscription price: $2.00 per year (for students, $1.00 per year); single copies, 50 cents. Address all subscriptions and communications to Progressive Calvinism League, 366 East 166th Street, South Holland, Illinois, U. S. A.

between obeying the Decalogue and prosperity, under the title *New Doubts Among Calvinists Whether Psalm One Belongs in the Canon of Scripture.* We write that article in a half-bantering note. Our purpose is to indicate that there is a "problem" regarding what the relationship is between obeying the Decalogue and prosperity. It is not a wholly simple relationship. Sceptics can attack our declaration that there is a favorable relationship between obeying the Decalogue and prosperity; we can equally attack the idea which they *seem* to hold, namely, that obeying the Decalogue involves the loss of prosperity. The truth, we are sure, lies between the *apparent* extremes. We begin by showing the impossible task which men will have of explaining plain Scripture texts if they declare that prosperity *never* follows from obedience to the Decalogue. They cannot, we believe, explain such texts, and must therefore declare they do not belong in Scripture; which, of course, they will not declare. Nor do we seriously say that they do declare it.

Then in this issue we endeavor to explain the meaning of certain terms in the social-political-economic field, the terms feudalism, individualism, socialism, syndicalism or guild socialism, and interventionism. We propose to use those terms frequently, hereafter. If their meanings are not clearly understood, what is written later in PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM will not be understandable.

PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM holds to what is presently the most misunderstood of those social-political-economic ideas, that is, we hold to Individualism. No one should consider us to be timid Individualists. We are unqualified and bold promoters of Individualism. The attack by others on Individualism is a controversy into which we walk with happiness and confidence.

We shall eventually analyze in detail the ideas of Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer as a Feudalist; Abraham Kuyper as an idealistic Syndicalist; the Christian Labor Association as Interventionist; John Calvin as an Individualist; etc.

F. N.

Cain: a Murderer, a Liar, and a Lawgiver

Cain is described as the first murderer who in a jealous rage slew his brother, Abel. We are against murder, and against the bad example of violence which Cain set.

Cain was also a liar. God asked Cain where his brother, Abel, was. Cain retorted: Am I my brother's keeper? Cain was lying in a very skillful manner; he was evading the question by another question which had nothing to do with the question originally asked. God asked the question because He knew Cain had killed Abel. Cain answered by asking, Do I have to look out for my brother, and know exactly where he is, and have to take care of him?

It is a pretty shabby argument to talk about an obligation to "keep" a brother when in fact you have just killed him. It was not a question of being his brother's *keeper* but of being his brother's *murderer.*

We have an interesting problem. Did Cain put forth the argument about not being his brother's keeper, believing that God would say that Cain actually was his brother's keeper, or did Cain put up a defense for himself which he believed God would accept? A man does not put up a defense which he believes the judge will not accept. He does the reverse; he advances an argument which he believes the judge will accept. That is our opinion of Cain's argument; we think that he believed God would not dispute the proposition that Cain did not have to look out for, and support, and mollycoddle Abel.

We believe Cain's argument was sound, namely, that he was not his brother's keeper in the sense that he had to peddle around after Abel on his farm to see to it that nothing happened to him, and that while following after him he (Cain) could neglect his own wife and children and his herds. Anyway, Cain would, as population increased, have quite a problem regarding whom he should protect — his own wife and children, or all his brothers, sisters, nieces and nephews, second cousins, grandnephews, etc.

If he had to protect them all, support them all, be the "keeper" of them all, Cain would soon have been more than busy.

We know Christians today who are devout but they seem never to have undertaken to be their brother's or neighbor's keeper. Those Christians look after their own children, but seldom bother about their brothers and sisters, or nieces and nephews, let alone more distantly related relatives.

It is interesting that God did not answer Cain and say that Cain should be his brother's keeper, that is, in the sense of taking care of his brother. Nor does Scripture in the same sense, as the mouthpiece of God, say anywhere else: Jones is his brother's *keeper;* and Smith is his brother's *keeper;* or that all men are their brothers' *keepers.*

The *principle* Cain advanced as his defense was a good one; he did not have to be a shepherd, or a keeper, of his grown-up brother. But he was lying by giving a wholly false impression. He had not minded his own business and let Abel mind his (of which Abel was undoubtedly fully capable) but he had cracked Abel over his head and killed him. It was not a question at all whether he had to follow Abel around to protect and to "keep" him; instead it was a question of being called to account for killing Abel. The case was a *fact* of murder, and not a *principle* of not being accountable for every other human being on the planet.

But what do people do? They consider that Cain was as wrong when he said he was not his brother's *keeper* as he was wrong when he was his brother's *murderer.* Such people extend the prohibition of murder to include the necessity of supporting the neighbor. The extension is unscriptural.

Over the period of a year or so we corresponded with a young man in the Netherlands who wanted a guarantor in order to immigrate into the United States. Eventually, he immigrated into Canada. The Christian Labour Association of Canada publishes a paper, *The Guide.* In the May, 1955 issue there is an article entitled "Labour Unions — Whither Christ." The article is signed with the same initials as our young Dutch friend.

The article contains the following statements:

> We believe that every man is his brother's keeper . . . For all men there must be a basic standard of living. Full employment, an annual wage system wherever possible, comprehensive family allowance, no racial discrimination and co-partnership.

Here again there is the fatal extension of the Biblical law of love to the anti-Biblical law of love of socialism-communism; that is exactly what socialism-communism teaches, namely, that I am my brother's keeper. The socialist-communist law of love, from each according to his ability to each according to his need, could not be summarized better than it has been in this labor publication where we read "every man is his brother's keeper."

Cain indirectly has done more harm to mankind by giving men an excuse for believing men are each other's keeper than he did by killing Abel. Cain's effect on bad ethics is pervasive and perennial; his murder of Abel was a single act.

And, sadly, we note in the quotation those other goals or principles which involve ideas not reconcilable with common sense nor with Scripture. But the analysis must wait for a suitable occasion.

We are against Cain as a murderer, and against Cain as a liar, and against Cain as a man who stated a principle under conditions which has resulted in almost universal misunderstanding.

F. N.

New Doubts Among Calvinists Whether Psalm One Belongs In The Canon of Scripture

The publishers of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM have learned with considerable astonishment that there is an objection among Calvinists regarding Psalm One.

We quote the psalm.

> 1. Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the wicked, Nor standeth in the way of sinners, Nor

> sitteth in the seat of scoffers: 2. But his delight is in the law of Jehovah; And on his law doth he meditate day and night. 3. And he shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water, That bringeth forth its fruit in its season, Whose leaf also doth not wither; And whatsoever he doeth shall prosper. 4. The wicked are not so, But are like the chaff which the wind driveth away. 5. Therefore the wicked shall not stand in the judgment, Nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous. 6. For Jehovah knoweth the way of the righteous; But the way of the wicked shall perish.

We learn that the objection is to verses three, four and five. These verses say that prosperity follows from obedience to the law of God, and that adversity follows from disobedience to the law of God.

PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM has as one of its platform planks the declaration:

> 5. (a) Promote confidence that prosperity obtained in a *free* market society is the result of obedience to the law of God; and (b) discontinue all apologies for that prosperity and all policies which will undermine that prosperity.

What the author of Psalm One says in verses three, four and five and what PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM says in Declaration 5 (a) are identical. When, therefore, we learn of objections to Declaration 5 (a) among Calvinists then we regret the necessarily corresponding objection they must have to Psalm One. But despite objections we hope and trust that verses three, four and five of that psalm will be kept in the canon (that is, in the Scriptures).

We have before us a subscription blank which has on it the following note in ink:

> Dear Brother:
>
> Please do not send me another copy: Job's three friends said it all long ago.
>
> Yours, etc.

The signer is an internationally distinguished Calvinist theologian.

What did Job's three friends say? They said that Job's troubles stemmed from secret sins of which he must have been guilty, or otherwise he would not have been afflicted as he was. In other words, those three friends said that *invariably* prosperity attends a good man, and that *invariably* adversity attends a wicked man. The idea is contrary to everyday observation and common sense.

Despite the allegation of our distinguished, internationally known ministerial critic we are *not* in agreement with Job's three friends. We said something altogether different in the explanation which we gave of Declaration 5 in the January issue of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM, pages 12-13. We there declared that there were exceptions to the rule, namely, of two kinds; we wrote as follows:

> But, it may be said, look at the distress and the poverty of the "righteous" in this world. Why are they in distress? For two reasons: (1) because of an enemy or because of an oppressive government, and (2) because of combinations of circumstances. But these are *exceptions* and they are not the kind of exceptions which invalidate the rule. The evil, most of which is public evil or group evil, should be resisted. The combinations of circumstances which constitute misfortune should be (and can be) alleviated by mutual assistance, or as it is called, charity.

In other words, we disagree with Job's three friends; prosperity does not *invariably* follow obedience to God's commands.

Job's friends said that "misfortune" is conclusive evidence of sin. No, that is not quite right; we do Job's friends an injustice. They said that the blows of misfortune *which appear to be the hand of God through providence,* especially illness as Job was suffering, should be interpreted as evidence of the chastising or chastening hand of God.

We know a man who lost money in the stock market crash in 1929-1934. He had engaged in some unethical acts in the 1920's and he considered his losses as a chastening act of God. Maybe. If he was correct, then our opinion is that God surely caused a lot of losses to a lot of people because of this one man's

unethical conduct! We do not believe that millions lost millions just for God to take away a few thousand dollars of the assets of our acquaintance. But *that* was his logic.

The "providence of God" cannot be interpreted glibly and personally in that manner, and *necessarily* be right. But that is what Job's friends were doing. We do not agree with them in either of their two propositions. The first was that God's providence is always selective in beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries, and the second was that Job had been a hypocritical sinner or he would not have been afflicted as he was.

We do agree with Psalm One. We believe that Psalm One states the basic rule correctly, towit, there is a benefit from not sinning, and a penalty from sinning. We do not see how anyone with common sense can disagree.

This whole question of prosperity and obedience to the Decalogue, we have come to realize, needs careful and extensive explanation. We shall eventually endeavor to do it.

F. N.

Feudalism, Individualism, Socialism, Syndicalism and Interventionism

There are several *terms* which need to be defined so that everybody knows what is being talked about. These terms are *feudalism, individualism, socialism, syndicalism* and *interventionism.*

Calvinists are not all feudalists, nor all individualists, nor all socialists, nor all interventionists, etc. There are some Calvinists in every classification. It is impossible for a Calvinist, or any human being, not to fall into one or more of these classifications.

Progressive Calvinism stands proudly and determinedly for individualism. What are you — a feudalist? an individualist? a socialist? a syndicalist? an interventionist?

A good definition of these terms requires a formal statement. To make the subject more understandable we shall approach the problem historically. Further, we shall take a relatively unknown

history, but one which will have special meaning among the members of the small Calvinist denominations in the United States, such as the Reformed and the Christian Reformed (both denominations originating among people from the Netherlands), etc.

Feudalism

Modern society eventually evolved out of the feudal society of the Middle Ages, the type of society which prevailed especially from the ninth to the fifteenth centuries.

Under the feudal system a man as vassal owed loyalty to his immediate chief. In return the chief was obligated to protect the vassal. A duke or a count or an earl owed loyalty to his king. The king in return was obligated to protect the duke, count and earl in his position. The duke, count or earl in turn had lesser noblemen who similarly owed loyalty or fealty, being obligated to military service but also being guaranteed protection by their liege lord (the duke, or count, or earl or who have you). Finally, at the bottom were the serfs who were obligated to their petty lord, and who were or were presumed to be protected by him. Feudalism meant fealty, that is, fidelity, by the vassal to his lord, and protection by the lord to his vassal. It was a tolerable arrangement for mutual benefit.

Let us see how Calvinists have adjusted themselves and moved from feudalism to more modern ideas.

One of the most famous Dutch Calvinists in the nineteenth century was Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer, (1801-1876), hereafter designated as usual by the shorter name, Groen. It is hardly possible to understand present-day orthodox Calvinism in the Netherlands or among the Netherlanders in the United States without understanding the rôle played by Groen.

Groen was a son in a distingushed family. His abilities were of a high order. He was courageously orthodox in his Calvinist ideas. He became a member of the Dutch parliament. He was appointed to be the official historian of the royal Dutch house, the famous family of Orange-Nassau. In the Secession of 1834 (a secession of orthodox Calvinists from the modernistic but historically Calvinist state church of the Netherlands) Groen was

probably the most distinguished Netherlander who without equivocation showed his sympathies for the persecuted Secessionists. Naturally, his influence would be proportionately great among them, and their later American counterparts, the Reformed church (in the Middle West) and the Christian Reformed church. He is, indeed, the fountainhead of various social-political-economic ideas in the denominations whose cause he courageously defended.

The royal Dutch house of Orange-Nassau could not be expected to appoint as official historian a man who was unsympathetic to that royal house and its famous forerunners, powerful *Stadhouders* and princes. Groen was an unashamed admirer of that princely and royal house. That house had performed heroic deeds in defense of Calvinism which Groen loved. The Netherlands had been most prosperous and most powerful when under the guidance of devout Calvinist princes of that house. The house of Orange-Nassau, and Calvinism, and prosperity, and power were inseparably linked together in Groen's mind. To Groen the house of Orange-Nassau had a claim on every Netherlander for loyalty. As Dengerink a few years ago wrote somewhere in his book, *Critisch-Historisch Onderzoek Naar de Sociologische Ontwikkeling van het Beginsel der "Souvereiniteit in Eigen Kring" in de Negentiende en Twintigste Eeuw,* Groen was essentially a feudalist; his idea was that the house of Orange-Nassau had a claim on every Netherlander for personal loyalty.

Pseudo-Individualism

That feudalist psychology of Groen, however, had been rudely challenged a generation earlier by Jean Jacques Rousseau, (1712-1778) son of a Swiss preacher. Rousseau's name is inseparably linked with the ideas of the French Revolution. Rousseau attacked the "divine right" of kings and all overlords, and of course, that included any reigning house, such as the house of Orange-Nassau.

Rousseau's argument presented in Book I of his *The Social Contract* is a superb analysis; the argument is as good as an atom bomb. Consider what Rousseau says about the false interpretation usually given to the Apostle Paul's injunction to obey the "powers that be."

> Suppose for a moment that this so-called "right" [of the "powers that be"] exists. I maintain that the sole result is a mass of inexplicable nonsense. For, if force creates right, the effect changes with the cause: every force that is greater than the first succeeds to its right. As soon as it is possible to disobey with impunity, disobedience is legitimate; and, the strongest being always in the right, the only thing that matters is to act so as to become the strongest. But what kind of right is that which perishes when force fails? If we must obey perforce, there is no need to obey because we ought; and if we are not forced to obey, we are under no obligation to do so. Clearly, the word "right" adds nothing to force: in this connection, it means absolutely nothing.
>
> Obey the powers that be. If this means yield to force, it is a good precept, but superfluous: I can answer for its never being violated. All power comes from God, I admit; but so does all sickness: does that mean that we are forbidden to call in the doctor? A brigand surprises me at the edge of a wood: must I not merely surrender my purse on compulsion; but, even if I could withhold it, am I in conscience bound to give it up? For certainly the pistol he holds is also a power.
>
> Let us then admit that force does not create right, and that we are obliged to obey only legitimate powers.

Progressive Calvinism detests the positive ideas of Rousseau, but acknowledges the validity of this critical argument against feudalism and against the "divine right of kings." Rousseau is not famous or infamous because he was wholly right or wholly wrong. We consider Rousseau to be wholly right when he states the problem is one of being "obliged to obey only *legitimate* powers." (Emphasis supplied.)

The attack by Rousseau on the divine right of kings would naturally be resisted by Groen, the official historian, and the panegyrist, of the house of Orange-Nassau. This was aggravated further by the excesses of the French Revolution, a movement which in part at least was a product of Rousseau's ideas. The war

cry of the French Revolution was *No God, and No Master.* Both ideas were offensive to a man who feared God and was loyal to the house of Orange-Nassau. Thirdly, Groen disagreed with the ideas of Rousseau and of the French Revolution in regard to how far the State could coerce individuals. Careful reading of Groen reveals that he objected to a political order which denied basic human rights. And, therefore, he vehemently disagreed with the ideas of Rousseau and of the French Revolution in which the "citizen" was swallowed up in the "people." Rousseau's ideas in regard to the State merely substituted the people as a tyrant in place of a king. Despite some obvious confusion in his ideas, Groen was essentially devoted to liberty and not to coercion. He corrected his unfortunately erroneous ideas on the divine right of kings by insisting on the sacredness of hard-earned prerogatives obtained by the people against their princes. That was his own personal corrective for his incorrect idea on the divine right of kings. By being unalterably opposed to the violation of the "rights" of individual persons by kings and princes, he was equally unalterably opposed to the violation of the rights of individual persons by the "people" allegedly acting collectively. And so, Groen is unflinchingly against Rousseau and the French Revolution.

The ideas of Rousseau, and of the French encyclopedists, the brain trusters of the French Revolution, acquired the name of individualism. And so Groen was opposed not only to Rousseau and to the French Revolution, but he was also opposed to individualism, which became the accepted term to describe the ideas of the French Revolution.

It is most unfortunate that Rousseau's ideas came to be known as individualism, because the term is incorrectly applied, and because the same term, individualism, is also applied to the exactly opposite ideas developed in England at about the same time. It is confusing to have one term, individualism, cover two systems of thought, which basically are in irreconcilable conflict.

The ideas of Rousseau and the school of thought to which he belonged represent what may be called *Rationalistic* Individualism. The ideas of Adam Smith and Edmund Burke and the great English representatives of individualism represent what may be called

Antirationalistic Individualism. The adjective, rationalistic, is used in the term, Rationalistic Individualism, to designate that this type of so-called individualism is rationalistic, confident in and arrogant about individual human reason. Human reason can *plan* and direct all social activities. This is all in the tradition of Descartes. The adjective, antirationalistic, is used in the term, Antirationalistic Individualism, to designate an attitude which considers man to be a very fallible and foolish being, incapable of running all of society by arrogant *human* planning.

Rationalistic Individualism is a false individualism. Eventually, it has always led to socialism or at least to interventionism. Antirationalistic Individualism is the true individualism. It always has been the term to describe just the opposite of socialism and interventionism.

The tragic thing is that Groen, prejudiced against a valid argument by Rousseau against the divine right of kings because he (Groen) was basically a feudalist, and hostile to the Rationalistic Individualism of Rousseau because he (Groen) clearly saw the basic error of Rousseau, should condemn individualism in *general* terms, and should fail to see that basically he (Groen) was in agreement with Antirationalistic Individualism.

The Dutch historian, Robert Fruin, (himself tainted with the ideas of Descartes and Comte and consequently himself to a degree a Rationalistic Individualist) attacked the error Groen made in failing to distinguish between Rationalistic Individualism and Antirationalistic Individualism. Groen was never able to answer him, or at least (I believe) did not endeavor to do so. Some of the present-day admirers of Groen admit Groen's error. (See article by Z. W. Sneller: "De Aanval van Fruin in 1853 op de auteur van *Ongeloof en Revolutie*" (The Attack of Fruin in 1853 on the Author of Unbelief and Revolution) which appeared in a book entitled *Groen's Ongeloof en Revolutie*. The book is a symposium, published in 1949.

Groen, then, was a feudalist, (1) who was incensed by Rousseau's valid argument against the divine right of kings, (2) who equated the term individualism with the Rationalistic Individualism of Rousseau and of the French Revolution, which Rationalistic

Individualism was never true individualism and which has always led to socialism (which is proof it could not be true individualism), (3) who failed to understand that the Antirationalistic Individualism developed in England by Adam Smith and Edmund Burke was something altogether different from the French variety and which was in fact vehemently opposed to it, (4) who criticized the United States (a) as a social, political and economic structure not feudal in psychology, which he thought it should be, (b) as a product of the French Revolution and Rationalistic Individualism which it was not, and (5) who failed to see that basically the United States was founded on Antirationalistic Individualism.

The usual interpretation of the official doctrine of the Christian Reformed Church on the relation between the individual and the State is feudal. That feudal doctrine is taught annually from many of its pulpits. The denomination has not been able to progress beyond the ideas of the sixteenth century any more than Groen was able. Practically all the leaders of Reformed thought among the Netherlanders also faithfully follow Groen's error in regard to confusing French Rationalistic Individualism with English Antirationalistic Individualism. Fortunately, Americans of Dutch extraction have been sufficiently influenced, thank God, by English Antirationalistic Individualism so that this whole trend of thought stemming from Groen has not in reality influenced them. Only a few intellectuals have been tainted with these errors.

Groen was a great man. We are a profound admirer of him. We have greatly benefited from reading what he wrote. His insights on many matters were profound and prophetic. His basic trouble was his feudalistic ideas. His successors lacked his basic judgment. They accepted Groen's erroneous ideas but failed to note the correctives which he had used to help himself from being too wrong.

True Individualism

It is only the Antirationalistic Individualism primarily developed in England which is the true individualism. The great names in the tradition of Antirationalistic Individualism are John Locke,

David Hume, Bernard Mandeville, Josiah Tucker, Adam Smith, Edmund Burke, and Adam Ferguson. Later two names stand out as men who correctly understood and believed in and described this Antirationalistic Individualism, the famous English historian, Lord Acton, and the famous French historian, Alexis de Tocqueville. In a still broader sense the whole Puritan and later Whig movement in English political history represented the ideas of Calvinism and of antirationalistic individualism. And consequently the Cromwells, the Pitts, the Gladstones, the Macauleys and others are all in the great tradition of Antirationalistic Individualism. They are the men who stood for ideas (1) that were in accordance with the social order prescribed by Scripture, and (2) that resulted in England becoming the then leading nation of the world.

It would be a mistake to believe that Antirationalistic Individualism was a purely British idea. The Low Countries had been the first, under the influence of the *independent* thinking that arose in those countries, to unshackle themselves from feudalism and mercantilism. (Mercantilism was the first development away from feudalism; mercantilism involved centralization, protection of home industry by tariffs, bureaucratic controls, and detailed regulation by civil authorities.) Because of that independent thinking the great development in and prosperity of England had been *preceded* by an amazing prosperity in the Low Countries which was the envy of the rest of the world. In *practice*, therefore, it may be said that Antirationalistic Individualism developed fully in the Netherlands before it did in England. But the Dutch did not develop the *theory* of Antirationalistic Individualism as did the British.

It is interesting to note that a Dutch prince, known to the Dutch as William III, the last of the descendents in the male line of the first Prince William of Orange, was perfectly adjustable to British thinking, as is evidenced by the blossoming out and prosperity of the Whig movement during his great reign, first as sovereign with his wife under the title, William and Mary, and after her death as William III.

The outstanding characteristic of Antirationalistic Individualism is *humility*. We do not here mean by humility a fawning attitude toward other men, or feebleness of convictions by which a

man shows vacillation when dealing with his fellows, but we refer to an intellectual attitude and appraisal of man and of man's mind. It is possible to appraise man and his mind highly; or in contrast to appraise man and his mind lowly. This is a fundamental question in epistemology — how is man and his mind to be appraised. Traditional Calvinism (and we are wholly in accord with traditional Calvinism) appraised man and his mind realistically, namely, man's intellect is feeble, his will is weak, and his character is invariably corrupted. This is, epistemologically, the position of Antirationalistic Individualism.

We quote from the famous essay by Dr. Friedrich A. von Hayek, entitled "Individualism: True and False," (which essay is the first in a book of essays by Hayek entitled *Individualism and Economic Order,* (The University of Chicago Press; copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago):

> The antirationalistic approach, which regards man not as a highly rational and intelligent but as a very irrational and fallible being, whose individual errors are corrected only in the course of a social process, and which aims at making the best of a very imperfect material, is probably the most characteristic feature of English individualism.

That basic attitude, that epistemology, that true humility is not possible for an advocate of any of the other systems of social ideas, that is, it is not possible *intellectually* and *morally* for a feudalist, for a socialist, or a communist, or a syndicalist, or an interventionist. Genuine realism in social matters and genuine intellectual humility are associated only with that attitude toward society which is called Antirationalistic Individualism.

It should be borne in mind that the term, *anti*rationalistic, does not mean that Antirationalistic Individualism is illogical or irrational; on the contrary, those holding to the ideas of Antirationalistic Individualism are criticized exactly for the consistency of their logic; their arguments cannot be answered and so their opponents attack the idea that logic has general rules and is the same for all men, an employer as well as for an employee. Antirationalistic Individualism is, therefore, not irrational individual-

ism; it *is* rational individualism but is against the rationalistic arrogance which consists in giving a superhuman evaluation to an ordinary human mind. *Antirationalistic,* then, is an adjective which indicates dissent from holding that man is wise, good and strong — capable of individually planning society and making it good. Clearly, in the sense that they both have the same true humility, Antirationalistic Individualism is the secular counterpart of traditional Calvinism. Hayek in another book, *The Counter-Revolution of Science,* (The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois) expresses the idea as follows:

> The main lesson at which we have arrived is indeed the same as that which one of the acutest students of scientific method has drawn from a survey of all fields of knowledge: it is that "the great lesson of humility which science teaches us, that we can never be omnipotent or omniscient, is the same as that of all great religions: man is not and never will be the god before whom he must bow down."* (Page 102.)

Elsewhere (pages six, seven, and eight) in "Individualism: True and False" Hayek writes about the true, that is, Antirationalistic Individualism as follows:

> . . . It is the contention that, by tracing the combined effects of individual actions, we discover that many of the institutions on which human achievements rest have arisen and are functioning without a designing and directing mind; that, as Adam Ferguson expressed it, "nations stumble upon establishments, which are indeed the result of human action but not the result of human design"; and that the spontaneous collaboration of free men often creates things which are greater than their individual minds can ever fully comprehend. This is the great theme of Josiah Tucker and Adam Smith, of Adam Ferguson and Edmund Burke, the great discovery of classical political economy which has become the basis of our understanding not only of economic life but of most truly social phenomena.

*The quotation by Hayek is from M. R. Cohen, *Reason and Nature,* page 449.

We are wholly in agreement with the foregoing. Ah, our friends may say, this is nothing more than a scientific expression of the idea (in some Calvinist circles) of *common grace;* however, *that* conclusion will need critical scrutiny, and will probably get it on another occasion.

Hayek then goes on to write (page eight):

> The difference between this view, which accounts for most of the order which we find in human affairs as the unforeseen result of individual actions, and the view which traces all discoverable order to deliberate design is the first great contrast between the true individualism of the British thinkers of the eighteenth century and the so-called "individualism" of the Cartesian [French] school. But it is merely one aspect of an even wider difference between a view which in general rates rather low the place which reason plays in human affairs, which contends that man has achieved what he has in spite of the fact that he is only partly guided by reason, and that his individual reason is very limited and imperfect, and a view which assumes that Reason, with a capital *R,* is always fully and equally available to all humans and that everything which man achieves is the direct result of, and therefore subject to, the control of individual reason.

Hayek later goes on to say:

> And, while the design theories [Rationalistic Individualism, that is, false Individualism] necessarily lead to the conclusion that social processes can be made to serve human ends only if they are subjected to the control of individual human reason, and thus lead directly to socialism, true individualism believes on the contrary that, if left free, men will often achieve more than individual human reason could design or foresee.
>
> This contrast between the true, antirationalistic and the false, rationalistic individualism permeates all social thought. But because both theories have become known by the same name, and partly because the classical econo-

> mists of the nineteenth century, and particularly John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer, were almost as much influenced by the French as by the English tradition, all sorts of conceptions and assumptions completely alien to true individualism have come to be regarded as essential parts of its doctrine.

A tentative summary of what has already been said about Antirationalistic Individualism will be helpful before calling attention to the most fundamental characteristic of this true individualism.

Firstly, Antirationalistic Individualism is not selfishness or exploitation of the neighbor. The proponents of true individualism have always favored safety of property, that is, they were against theft; they have always opposed violence as a disruptive force in society; they have always insisted on honesty being the best policy. In short, they have always accepted the rules of the second table of the Decalogue in its most fundamental sense, namely, that the neighbor might not be harmed. In general, Antirationalistic Individualism has agreed with the definition of the law of love presented in earlier issues of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM; (the obvious exception is that this secular doctrine has not concerned itself with the spreading of the Christian gospel).

Secondly, Antirationalistic Individualism represents intellectual humility and social and political realism. Other social doctrines do not promote true intellectual humility, but instead are based on conscienceless arrogance, and involve an evil hubris. A basic reason why men are true individualists is that they *cannot* do more than tend to their own affairs; they *cannot* wisely guide the lives of others; and they never should consider themselves to be that "smart."

This is how Hayek states the idea:

> Far more important than this moral attitude, which might be regarded as changeable, is an indisputable intellectual fact which nobody can hope to alter and which by itself is a sufficient basis for the conclusions which the individualist philosophers drew. This is the constitutional limitation of man's knowledge and interests, the

> fact that he *cannot* know more than a tiny part of the whole of society and that therefore all that can enter into his motives are the immediate effects which his actions will have in the sphere he knows. All the possible differences in men's moral attitudes amount to little, so far as their significance for social organization is concerned, compared with the fact that all man's mind can effectively comprehend are the facts of the narrow circle of which he is the center; that, whether he is completely selfish or the most perfect altruist, the human needs for which he *can* effectively care are an almost negligible fraction of the needs of all members of society.

We came, thirdly, to what we believe is a still more fundamental reason for holding to Antirationalistic Individualism. We shall begin again by quoting Hayek.

> The real question, therefore, is not whether man is, or ought to be, guided by selfish motives but whether we can allow him to be guided in his actions by those immediate consequences which *he can know* and care for or whether he ought to be made to do *what seems appropriate to somebody else* who is supposed to possess a fuller comprehension of the significance of these actions to society as a whole. (Emphasis supplied.)
>
> To the accepted Christian tradition that man must be free to follow *his* conscience in moral matters if his actions are to be of any merit, the economists added the further argument that he should be free to make full use of *his* knowledge and skill, that he must be allowed to be guided by his concern for the particular things of which *he* knows and for which *he* cares, if he is to make as great a contribution to the common purposes of society as he is capable of making. Their main problem was how these limited concerns, which did in fact determine people's actions, could be made effective inducements to cause them voluntarily to contribute as much as possible to needs which lay outside the range of their vision. What the economists understood for the first time was that the

market as it had grown up was an effective way of making man take part in a process more complex and extended than he could comprehend and that it was through the market that he was made to contribute "to ends which were no part of his purpose."

It was almost inevitable that the classical writers in explaining their contention should use language which was bound to be misunderstood and that they thus earned the reputation of having extolled selfishness. We rapidly discover the reason when we try to restate the correct argument in simple language. If we put it concisely by saying that people are and ought to be guided in their actions by *their* interests and desires, this will at once be misunderstood or distorted into the false contention that they are or ought to be exclusively guided by their personal needs or selfish interests, while what we mean is that they ought to be allowed to strive for whatever *they* think desirable.

What does the foregoing say? It says this: the problem is not basically one of anarchical self-interest, nor for that matter either is it a problem of the limitation of the human mind, but instead in the final analysis the question is *who* should decide, *you* or *your neighbor*. Note how Hayek wrote it: ". . . . what we mean is that they ought to be allowed to strive for what *they* think desirable"; and note what he says elsewhere: "The true basis of his [the individualist's] argument is that nobody can know *who* knows best and that the only way by which we can find out is through a social process in which everybody is allowed to try and see what he can do. (The italics are Hayek's.)

And what does that mean? It means that the most famous economists of the world (as interpreted by Hayek) say this: thou shalt love thy neighbor *as thyself*. You can decide for *yourself*. When the basic argument is uncovered it gets down to this: the question is *who* is to decide for you — yourself *or* your neighbor. The issue must be either — or. Both cannot decide. As has been outlined in previous issues of Progressive Calvinism, Scripture teaches that each man *himself* is the proper judge of his affairs

and not his *neighbor*. As has just been quoted, that is exactly what the great Antirationalistic Individualists* declared.

Dutch Calvinists beginning with Groen have nearly all been attacking French Individualism, that is, false individualism, the individualism correctly described as Rationalistic Individualism. Then being nondiscriminating they also attacked true individualism, correctly described as Antirationalistic Individualism. Emigrants presently streaming into the United States and into Canada are bringing along with them an antagonism to the traditional American social-political-economic structure based on a confusion a hundred years old and still not corrected. These emigrants have been conditioned against an Antirationalistic Individualism, which is the sole reason for America's greatness, by a fixation of their critical attention on its opposite, Rationalistic Individualism, which has been of inestimable damage to France, the Netherlands, and all countries in any way tainted with it. Why? Because that Rationalistic Individualism inescapably leads to socialism or interventionism.

There are three practical manifestations of Antirationalistic Individualism which should be mentioned; it holds to (1) the *private* ownership of property, (2) a *free* market, and (3) *unequal* rewards in proportion to the unequal satisfaction of the neighbor's needs. These are exactly in accord with the teaching of Scripture. Space is lacking to expand on these ideas at this time.

Progressive Calvinism is well informed on the undiscriminating wrath and contempt poured on individualism generally (of all kinds) by fellow Calvinists. We plan to quote and quote and quote that sorry record and call attention to its absurd errors. We expect attempts will be made to dismiss our views by the supercilious remark that Progressive Calvinism represents outmoded individualism.

*Readers who are accustomed to serious reading should certainly read Hayek's essay entitled: "Individualism: True and False" in *Individualism and Economic Order*. And readers who are qualified to be interested in the problems of epistemology should also read Hayek's *Counter-Revolution of Science*. This latter is more technical than the former.

Socialism

The term, socialism, was coined to be the opposite, the antonym for individualism. (If you wish to be known as a real opponent of socialism then there is only *one* name you can assume, the name of individualist.)

Socialism is founded on the idea that the neighbor is the legitimate controller of your choices, your activities, your property, your life. Individualism is founded on the idea that you yourself are the legitimate controller of your choices, your activities, your property, your life.

There are many brands of socialism, and there are endless varieties among the various brands. We aim to be brief and shall comment on only three phases of socialism: (1) the public ownership of the means of production; (2) the "organization" of society in an "economic order" which socialism requires; and (3) the "distribution" of the proceeds of production among the various participants and claimants according to a set of principles called "social justice."

1. Socialism disputes the basic right of a man to ownership of things. Nothing a man may have is really his own. Private property ownership is suspect and to be forbidden.

Some socialists would permit private ownership of consumers' goods, but all socialists demand public ownership of producers' goods, that is, of lands, mines, factories, machines, transportation facilities, power projects, etc.

All the wars and persecutions among men have together hurt the human race less than public ownership of property. No plague has ever been so terrible to the bodies of men as the public ownership of the means of production has been to the prosperity of men.

2. Socialism concerns itself also with the way society is organized. Socialism proposes an "organization" of society which involves *coercion* and endless controls. Society is to be *directed*. Society is not to be *free*. The neighbor, *collectively* through the state or other *collective* agencies, is to determine what the individual may do. The consumers, they themselves, are no longer to deter-

mine the "order" of society, but producers or a functionary of the state are to determine that. Socialism, therefore, from the standpoint of the "social order" involves a program of coercion, and the enforcement of another man's program on you. This is the opposite of the program of Antirationalistic Individualism, which, in contrast to socialism, opposes coercion, wishes the consumer to be free, and makes the consumer *individually* the standard, or center of gravity in the social order.

3. Then there is the third phase of socialism which directs attention to the "distribution" of the proceeds of production. The word, distribution, here has a special meaning. By "distribution" we mean how much each man gets of what is produced. (We are here up against the problem, from each according to his ability to each according to his need.) One way to "distribute" what is produced is to distribute *equally*. Another way is to distribute according to some other rule but still to distribute *coercively*. Another way is to distribute the shares in what was produced *in accordance with the demands which each fulfilled* — one man more, and another man less; this is the individualist and scriptural way of distribution; it is unequal, because the contribution of each man to the fulfillment of the wants of his neighbors is unequal; it is brotherly, because it does not involve coercion, everything being exchanged in a voluntary market; it is cooperative, because freedom entails voluntary action in contradistinction of coercion which entails the use of force.

The *distribution* phase of socialism, as distinguished from the *ownership* and *production* phases advocated by socialism, is the most widely accepted of the three phases of socialism; this is also true in the Christian Reformed church. This, it is believed, is in notorious neglect of the teachings of Scripture or the tradition of Calvinism.

For example, for more than forty years there has been a *progressive* income tax in the United States. A progressive tax is a tax with a higher rate for some than for others. That kind of a tax is a key plank in the *distributive* system demanded by socialism and communism (see Marx and Engel's *Communist Manifesto*). But in the more than forty years in which that income tax has existed, no voice (to our knowledge) has been raised in the Chris-

tian Reformed church against that specific socialist program in violation of the principles of Scripture.

Apparently, nearly all devout Calvinists in the Christian Reformed church believe in inequality in the laws, and a variable measuring stick. The progressive income tax rule is designed to injure those who have more, but it can be shown to work against those who have less far more than against the former. (This is just another case where the declaration of Scripture is borne out when it says that whosoever digs a pit for his neighbor to fall into will fall into it himself.)

The general idea of "progression" (as in the *progressive* income tax) is unknown in Scripture, and clearly is obnoxious to the principles stated in Scripture. Consider such an obvious piece of evidence as the fact that nowhere in Scripture is "progression" declared to be a part of the law of charity. The minimum *law* of charity (as distinguished from the voluntary *practice* of charity beyond that law) is a flat ten percent. There is no progression mentioned whatever. And wisely so, because the progression can be shown to be harmful for the poor — finally. Here again Scripture and sound economics and Individualism agree.

In connection with the high-sounding propaganda of socialism it is necessary to call attention to its transvaluation or confusion of ideas in connection with the idea of justice.

Individualism — and Scripture — concern themselves about *justice*. Socialism denies justice, as outlined by Scripture and accepted by individualism, and believes in a so-called *social* justice. If such social justice were the same as justice it would not be necessary to add the adjective *social* to the term, social justice. The addition of the adjective does not designate something *additional* to justice, but something *different from* justice. Social justice and scriptural justice are antinomies—that is, they are irreconcilable opposites and contraries. Progressive Calvinism is against all *social* justice. It considers everything that is specifically *social* justice to be contrary to the plain teaching of Scripture. We stand *for* justice; we stand *against* social justice.

It is planned that we give the idea of *social* justice extensive, critical examination.

Syndicalism

Syndicalism has another name, guild socialism, but is definitely to be distinguished from socialism itself.

Syndicalism comes from the French word, syndics, which means unions. Syndicalism is then a society based on groups of producers.

The simplest way to distinguish syndicalism from socialism is that syndicalism makes the producers *in a particular industry* the owners of *that particular industry,* in contrast to socialism making *all the people* owners of *all industry.* According to syndicalism everybody connected with textiles would own the textile industry; and everybody connected with coal mining would own the coal mining industry.

The most famous of modern syndicalists (in principle) was Benito Mussolini, with his corporate state.

The customary way that the idea of syndicalism is introduced is to propose "cooperation" between employers and labor in an industry. The two should "get together." That was a favorite idea of Dr. Abraham Kuyper, a well-known Dutch theologian and politician; at heart he considered syndicalism the *ideal* form of society. We plan to substantiate that idealism of Kuyper in later issues of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM by quotations from Kuyper's *Ons Program* (Our Program) and *Anti-Revolutionaire Staatkunde* (Anti-Revolutionary Statecraft).

Syndicalism is a device for conducting a nongeographical civil war. The American civil war was between the North and the South — geographical (and political) entities. But syndicalism proposes warfare between industries. The textile industry (by collusion between owners, management and labor) will raise wages and then (because the industry is "cooperating" and a monopoly) raise prices. Nobody can stop it. The victims? Oh, everybody else, who has no choice except to pay the price or go naked.

But then what will the coal mining industry do? Oh, it will also raise wages, and then in order to take care of the extra cost, it too will put up the prices of coal; owners, management and labor

will all "cooperate" to accomplish the exploitation of the consumers of coal.

Then the steel industry will do the same thing. And the shipping industry. And the food industry. Etc.

This, as was said, is setting up a system for inter-industry civil war. Yes, the government is supposed to police these various monopolies, and restrain them, and maybe judge between them. But the power of the government to be an arbiter between these monopolistic industrial behemoths has always been insufficient. The civil war will continue to go on.

There is a large amount of syndicalism in the world. Syndicalism is already extensive in the United States and is probably the most harmful single factor in American society. But American syndicalism does not go by the name of syndicalism. Here we call it unionism. John L. Lewis is a potential syndicalist. If he could only get *real cooperation* from coal mine operators, he would really develop syndicalism. First, they (he and the mine owners) would put up the wages; then they would put up the prices, and make the public like it. (Of course, other industries could and would play the same game.)

The steel industry already operates substantially on a syndicalist basis *unavoidably,* because of union pressure. The wages are pressured upward by the unions on the ground of *social* justice or some other reason. Finally, the steel companies surrender. Then to make good the increased cost, the owners promptly raise steel prices. The victims, again, are *all* the buyers who have no option but to pay. But why complain if that is the system which the people want, as they apparently do.

Of course, a system which really means nongeographical civil war whether proposed by Mussolini, or an Abraham Kuyper, or John L. Lewis even though it sounds good theoretically can hardly be expected to be either scriptural or good economics. And it is neither. We shall develop the evidence in later issues.

One of the several books written by Dr. Ludwig von Mises, world-famous economist and one of the greatest economists of all time, is entitled *Socialism—an Economic and Sociological Analysis*

(Yale University Press). (This is the definitive, critical analysis of socialism and of the various related social systems, including syndicalism.) Mises ends his comments on syndicalism, as follows:

> As an aim Syndicalism is so absurd, that speaking generally, it has not found any advocates, who dared to write openly and clearly in its favour. Those who have dealt with it under the name of co-partnership have never thought out its problems. Syndicalism has never been anything else than the ideal of plundering hordes. (Page 275.)

The reader will remember that earlier in this issue we quoted from an article in *The Guide,* published by the Christian Labour Association of Canada. One of the objectives stated in that quotation is "co-partnership," a form of syndicalism referred to by Mises in the foregoing. "Co-partnership" is also an objective of the Christian Labor Association in the United States. We plan to analyze the idea in later issues.

There are undoubtedly thousands of convinced syndicalists in so-called Calvinist churches.

Interventionism

The real favorite among the rank-and-file of Calvinists is not feudalism, nor individualism, nor socialism, nor syndicalism, but interventionism. The reason for their interest in Interventionism is not because of their "Calvinism" but because their thinking merely reflects current public opinion.

Interventionism establishes a "regulated" society. The idea of the interventionists is that individualism is selfishness and bad (that idea is, of course, naive); that socialism is not right either but not too bad an idea (except that leading socialists have been atheists); and so interventionists would set up a society which is a cross-breed between individualism and socialism; they still say that they believe in private property as do individualists, but the freedom of individualism — which freedom is bad! — will be restrained and guided by extensive regulation by wise and nonpolitical and virtuous political employees. The assumption is that it is not hard for a man under political pressure still to be honest!

Hitler was, as he acknowledged, basically a socialist, but he considered thoroughgoing interventionism a suitable form for accomplishing his generally socialist ideas. He is said to have used a simple illustration, in this wise: In Russia they want the milk, and to do that take away the ownership of the cow. In Germany we leave them keep the cow, but we "control" who gets the milk. And then he cynically added: What difference does it make that Germans think they still own the cow when we control all that the cow produces? They are happier, but the ownership of the cow really means nothing to them now that we get all the product of the cow.

That was thoroughgoing interventionism. Presently in the United States the social-political-economic situation is a moderate interventionism. Interventionism is never fully effective unless it becomes thoroughgoing. Interventionism is widely accepted as a "middle-of-the-road" policy, but it eventually leads to socialism.*

Dutch Calvinists from Abraham Kuyper on have been entranced with interventionism. It is their well-beloved doctrine. It is also the doctrine taught in Calvin College of the Christian Reformed church in the United States. Probably, it is the prevailing doctrine in most other Calvinist schools in the country. It is also the accepted doctrine of the Christian Labor Association.

Interventionism can be attacked on the ground that its premises are not in harmony with the basic propositions of Calvinism, and on the ground that it is internally inconsistent. PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM will devote considerable attention to the untenability of Interventionism.

Summary

The foregoing semi-historical summary of feudalism, individualism, socialism, syndicalism and interventionism is too sketchy to be satisfactory but it will have to serve for the time being. These ideas touch on the relation of men-to-men so vitally that we shall be referring to them repeatedly in subsequent issues. Later

* See Ludwig von Mises' essay: "Middle-of-the-Road Policy Leads to Socialism," in his book of essays entitled *Planning for Freedom.*

references will, we hope, greatly add to clarity regarding these political and economic systems.

There are two reasons for the particular character of our presentation which we wish expressly to state.

1. We consider Antirationalistic Individualism to be the social and economic system which conforms most closely to the teaching of Scripture and the principles of Calvinism. Antirationalistic Individualism has flowered where Calvinism flowered — in Switzerland, the Netherlands (in its halcyon days), England and Scotland, and the United States. The Puritans who surely made a tremendous contribution to England's greatness were devout Calvinists and individualists. The greatest heroes and the greatest leaders the Dutch have ever had were Calvinists and individualists. (However we are not implying that all individualists are Calvinists, or vice versa.)

We are, in that great tradition, Calvinists *and* individualists. We do not expect, however, that individualism should stand for everything for which Calvinism stands. Individualism is a social and economic doctrine. Calvinism is a religion. They overlap; they cannot be and are not the same.

We, proudly, claim the name, individualist, as well as we proudly claim the name, Calvinist.

2. Our second reason for the specific type of presentation which we employed was to reveal our views on Dutch Calvinist tradition regarding individualism. We consider the prevailing Dutch Calvinist attitude toward individualism to be Continental European and unhappily parochial and unenlightened. We outlined the reason — a preoccupation with French, that is Cartesian (from the French rationalist, Descartes) and Rousseauian Rationalistic Individualism. We explained briefly (in fact, so briefly that the point is not effectively made) that a great Netherland's churchman, scholar and statesman, Groen van Prinsterer, basically misunderstood individualism; (we shall develop that later). His successors, Abraham Kuyper, especially, proceeded blithely and with inadequate knowledge in the same channel of thought. We believe Kuyper seriously aggravated a bad misunderstanding.

Consequently, we shall be constrained to challenge the influence of a large segment of Dutch Calvinist thought on American Calvinist thought. We think Dutch Calvinist thought in the social-political-economic fields has not been and is not helpful to American Calvinist thinking. We *personally* follow the American tradition on Antirationalistic Individualism. We consider it far better than the feudalism, syndicalism, and interventionism emanating from the Netherlands. We consider our economic heritage far better, and more Biblical, and more Calvinist, and more-rewarding.

In regard to the term "more-rewarding" we can make our point clear in this manner: if the economic ideas of Abraham Kuyper had come to the United States and genuinely been put into effect one hundred years ago, the prosperity of the United States today (in our opinion) would not be one-half of what it is now. We thank God that those ideas were not transported here then, and we view with apprehension that they be imported now.

The Writings of Two Famous Living Individualists

There are two world-famous economists who are the greatest living exponents of true Individualism. Their names are Dr. Ludwig von Mises and Dr. Friedrich A. von Hayek. Both were originally at the University of Vienna. Both left Austria before Hitler came in.

Mises is professor of economics at New York University. He is the author of famous economic works, including *Human Action — A Treatise on Economics; Socialism — an Economic and Sociological analysis; The Theory of Money and Credit; Omnipotent Government — The Rise of the Total State and Total War; Bureaucracy;* and *Planning for Freedom and other Essays and Addresses.*

The major works of Mises are of epoch-making significance.

Hayek is associated with the Law School of the University of Chicago. He is in the same tradition as Mises. His well-known books include *The Road to Serfdom; The Counter-Revolution of*

Science, Individualism and Economic Order; Profits, Interest and Investment; and *The Pure Theory of Capital.*

Our indebtedness to Mises and Hayek is beyond measure. To those accustomed to reading in the fields covered by their books we earnestly recommend the reading of those books.

The logical connection between the secular works of these famous economists and the ancient principles of Scripture will be worthy of careful study.

F. N.

The Christian religion is not so great an influence as it should be. Most people in so-called Christian nations are relatively indifferent to a *personal* brand of the Christian religion, which is another way of saying that they do not care much what Christianity specifically teaches.

An important reason for such indifference is the unsoundness of many ideas which are declared to be Christian and are palmed off on the public as being Christian, and believed by the naive to be Christian, but which smarter people reject or ignore because they "sense" that there is something wrong with those ideas.

PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM is a monthly devoted to a *critical* examination of pious ideas which are neither scriptural nor logical.

PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM LEAGUE
366 East 166th Street
South Holland, Illinois, U.S.A.

BULK RATE
U. S. Postag
PAID
SOUTH HOLLAND,
Permit No. 1

POSTMASTER:
If change of address on file, notify us on Form 3547 (for which postage is guaranteed).
If not deliverable, check reason in spaces below. Return postage guaranteed.
☐ **Returned at sender's request**
☐ **No such Post Office in state named**
☐ **Moved—left no address**
☐ **Refused**
☐ **Unclaimed or unknown**